

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1892-3
191.
(*Mutrai*)

File No. 163

Serial Nos.

Papers Filed.

Month _____

SUBJECT.

*Institution of a civil suit for the
recovery of certain lands belonging to the
Sri Chennigasayaswami temple at Hadina:
in the Nanjangud Taluk*

PREVIOUS REFERENCES

LATER REFERENCES

Muz F 146-08

1893.

From

The ~~Chief~~ Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

To

The Govt Advocate.

Bangalore

Dated 23

Despatched 27

Received

Enclosures No. 1

General No. 529
No.

In forwarding herewith
a file of papers relating
to certain lands attached
to the Chemagirayaswamy
Temple, at Hadinaru, Nan
Jungode Taluk. has the
honor to request the
favor of ^{his} ~~an~~ early. his
opinion whether the Sh
Muralai Officer, on behalf
of the Temple, can ^{institute} ~~file~~
a Civil Suit for the
Cancellation of the alienation
of the Temple property, and
for the proper appropriation
of its produce for the



From The Government Advocate
in Mysore

To The Secretary to the Deewan
of Mysore
Muzrai Department.

Dated 15th April 1893

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. 1 file

General No. 60
No.

Sir,

In reply to your letter
No. 529 dated 23rd February
1893, I have the honor to
state that on a perusal
of the papers & the Govern-
ment decision in Appeal
No. 179 of 1891, I feel
unable to advise a
Civil Suit by the Muzrai
Department on behalf
of the Temple. The Issues
referred to, to the Temple
were resumed by the
Deewan Commissioners
and full assessment
was

Enclosures returned
hereinto

From the Vernacular Accounts
it especially from the
Kannada just Pathy ch
is quite clear that
Pattah for the lands has
been made out in the
name of the archak for
and on behalf of the
Temple - He can only be
regarded as trustee -

Suit should be
instituted in a proper
Civil Court for the recovery
of the land - distinct to be
accordingly. his
the right

was imposed upon them in 1881-82 and
the issue of Patta conferred ownership
on the Pattadas.

2. Unless it could be clearly
established that the Pattadas held the
lands as a Trustee to the Temple, and
the Abnnee of the lands was aware of the
Trusteeship, I am of opinion that the
suit will fail.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant.

L. Munnayy
Government Advocate

MUZARAYI.

(General Serial No. 30.)

189 .

From

To J. C. Mysore

Dated /

Despatched 2 May

Received

Enclosures No

General No. 750
Muzarayi, F. No. 163-92

11

Alienation of certain
lands attached to the
Chennigarayaswami
Temple in Hadinaru
village, Nanjinguad Tq.

Read —

Correspondence ending
with Rubkari N^o 1158 of 17th
December 1892 from the
Deputy Commissioner Mysore District
regarding the alienation of
certain lands attached to the
Chennagiri Sivaswami temple
in Hadimaru village, Nungur,
Taluk.

no 750 of
muz 7 163-92

1st May 93

order thereon N^o 1158

From the entries in
the Kaumie, jati book of
the year 1881-2, it is evident
that on the resumption of the
Inam lands held by the
temple, the Patta thereof was
made in the name of
Sreenivasabhatta, in his
capacity as Pujari of,

to him and not in
the London right.
consequently we can have
no claim on him - he is
entirely irrespective of the
land - the situation of
the land should therefore
be settled in a civil
court.

2. The Deputy Comr.
will accordingly instruct
the District Magistrate
officer to institute a
civil suit on behalf of
the temple for the
cancellation of the situation
of the land and for the
recovery of their possession
with the cost, interest

A. X.
Secretary

To
The Dy. Commr.
Mylapore District -
(Return the Ver. Record)

Draft for approval

No 199

Rem 11:1
ಮುಂದಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪತ್ರವಿಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಸೂಚನೆ
ಮಾಡುವುದು-

ಈ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ ಮುಂದಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪತ್ರವಿಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಸೂಚನೆ

at
18/11/2018

ಈ ಮುಂದಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪತ್ರವಿಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಸೂಚನೆ
ಮಾಡುವುದು 18/11/2018
ಮುಂದಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪತ್ರವಿಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಸೂಚನೆ
ಮಾಡುವುದು 18/11/2018
ಮುಂದಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪತ್ರವಿಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಸೂಚನೆ
ಮಾಡುವುದು 18/11/2018



Offg: Dy Secy
Mysore

tin
3
2

thereof

b/ is
warded
in audit,
at from
s funds of
bale at the
credit

ugrae 8

Read: — Roolkari No. 199 of 30th

July 1893, from the Deputy
Commr., Mysore D^o submitting
for sanction a bill for Rs 80/-
being the amount of advance
required for filing a civil
suit against one Greenivasa
Bhatta, Archik of the Chenniga-
-rayaswami temple in the
village of Hadinaru, Nanjira-
-gud Taluk for the cancellation
of the alienation ^{made by him} of the land
belonging to the temple & the
recovery of the possession thereof.

R
 $\frac{12347}{2} - 8 - 93$
In 7.163-92 En 1 file v.P. 71

Order thereon - No.

The bill for Rs 80/- is
sanctioned and forwarded
to the Comptroller for audit,
the charge being met from
the Gt. Muz. Surplus Funds of
No 7256-12-3 available at the
credit

of the District on the 1st July
1893.

MUZARAYI.

(General Serial No 39)

189 .

To
From
Secretary
C²

The Dy. Commr. Mysore Dist.
returning the enclosures

- 1. Comptroller to the Govt.
of Mysore with bill
bearing the Treasury
Officer's certificate.

To D.C. Mysore
Comptroller

Dated 1 - 8 93

Despatched 2 "

Received

Enclosures No. 4 file.

General No. 123-4

Muzarayi, P. No. 163-4.

Draft

reiving the amount required for filing
civil suit against one Grenevasa Bhatta Archaka of
Chennigarayaswamy temple at Hadinaru Hobly
Mangalore Taluk.

Particulars	Amount	Remarks
Amount required for filing a civil suit against one Grekantha Bhatta Archaka of Chennigarayaswamy temple.	80 - -	The amount of the bill should be from the G. S. Surpl Fund of the temple as it stood on 1/1/19
Total Rs Rupees eighty only	- -	

326
MUZARAI.

(General Serial No. 30.)

1896.

From

The Deputy Commr.,
Mysore District

To

The Murray Secretary

Dated

7/10/96

Despatched

Received

9

Enclosures No. 1

General No.

Muzarai F. No.

701

Submitting for sanction
a bill for Rs 50/- required
to meet the court costs
of the civil suit filed
in the Rangangud mun-
-siffs court for the recovery
of the Jodi land belonging
the Chenigarayaswamy
temple at Hadinaroo,
Rangangud Taluk -

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore.—26-9-93-1,000.

To the same No 518-9 & 13/10/96
143-92

101
es No. one

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE,
MYSORE DISTRICT,
Dated Mysore 7th October 1896.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
~~Revenue and General Department.~~
Muzrai Department

SIR,

The Jodi land belonging to the Chennig
- rana Swamy temple at Hadinaroo^{with} in the
Nanjangod Taluk was alienated by the Archak
of the temple as if it were his personal property,
and a sum of Rupees 80/- was sanctioned, in
Government Proceedings No. 123-4 dated the 12th
Feb 1892 August 1893, to meet the Court Costs attendant
on filing a Suit in the Nanjangod munsiff's
Court for the recovery of ^{the} land to the temple. The
Amildar now reports that the said sum of
Rupees 80/- has been used up in meeting the
Court Costs up to date, and that a further
sum of Rupees 50/- is required to meet the
future costs.

2. I beg, therefore, that the
sanction of Government may be obtained
to the enclosed bill, the amount being met,

Read:-

Govt. Pro no. 128-4.
Muz F 163-92

of 1st Aug 1893 Sanction
Rs 80 towards the cost
of filing a Civil Suit
against Datt Srin was
Bhatta Archak of the
Sri Venkateswara
Temple @ Hadnarn
Nampurud ~~San~~ Taluk
for the cancellation
of the alienation
made by him of the land
belonging to the Temple
& the recovery of the
possession thereof.

And.

Letter no. 701 of
7th Oct 1896 reporting
that Rs 80 the sum
of Rs 80 sanctioned in the
above has been

no: 1225026.2.97

already expended
and sanctioning

for a further advance
of Rs 50 for the purpose

MUZRAI.

189

From

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore.

To

Goods thereon

The advance of Rs 50
asked
by the S^r is sanctioned;
and the bill int^d.
by him for the purpose
will be forwarded
to the Compt^r. for audit.

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No.

Muzrai F. No.

Enclosure No.

2- A detailed state-
ment of the expendi-
tures incurred in
connection with the
Brit. Shd. as promised.
It sh^d. be sent by post

course.

As
Muz- Secy
and

To the S^r. Mysore Shd
The Compt^r for audit.

MUZRAJ

1897

From

By Commissioner
The Secretary to the *Govt*
Government of Mysore. *D. L.*

To

Dated

6th Feb 1897.

Despatched

Received

1225

General No.

Muzraj F. No.

Enclosure No.

Submitting explanation
called for in Govt order

978-9 dated 13 October
M. F. 163-92

1896 regarding expend-

iture of Rs 88-3-5

in a suit against the

Archak of the Sri

Chennigara Swami

Temple in Nayangud

Taluk.

h. v. al
16.2.97

The same no.

20/6.2.97

No 1225
Dn. 6-2-

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Mysore District

Dated Mysore 6th February 1897

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
in the Mysore Department

Sir,

As called for in Government order
No 578-9 dated 13th October 1896, I have the
honor to forward herewith the statement re-
ceived from the Amildar of Rangangode taluk
showing the details of expenditure of Rupees
88-3-5 incurred in connection with the
suit against Sreenivasa Bhatta Archak
of the Sri Channigaraya Swamy temple
at Hadinaru in the Rangangode taluk.
The Amildar states that when a greater
portion of the sum of Rupees 80 sanctioned
in Government Proceedings No 123-4
dated 1st August 1893 to meet the Court costs
of the said suit had been spent, he applied
in September 1896 / which was communi-
cated in the office letter No 701 dated 7th
October 1896 / for an additional sum of
Rs 50-11-0, which was sanctioned by
Government in October 1896 in order

No

No $\frac{518.9}{27/183-93}$. The amount however could
not be drawn before receipt of the Comptroller's
instructions to the Treasury Officer
for payment. The Amildar therefore
had to meet the urgent demand for Court
costs by drawing an advance of Rs 8-12-⁰⁰
from certain funds of the Speekanteswara
Swamy temple which has since been
adjusted. Hence the detailed statement
for Rupees 88-3-5.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most Obedt^{ly} Servant,

G. S. S. S. S.
Deputy Commissioner
of the Mysore District

MUZRAI.

1897

From

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore.

To

The Deputy Commr
Mysore District

Dated 16

Despatched February 1897

Received

General No.

Muzrai P. No.

R C 49
163-92

Enclosure No. 1

His letter No. 1225 dated
6th February 1897, submitted
a detailed statement of
expenditure amounting to
Rs 88.3-5 incurred in con-
-nection with the suit filed
against Srinivasa Bhatt
Archak of the Sri Chenn-
-garaya swami temple at
Hadrarn, Nanjangud Tal-
-uk.

In the above,

A It is reported that in
addition to the advance of
Rs 80 sanctioned in Govt
Proceedings No. ~~510~~
123-4 dated

Muz 7/63-92

from the same No. 1360 of 6.3.97

1896/97

21

From

The Deputy Commissioner
of the Mysore District

To

The Secretary to the
Govt of Mysore
in the Moogaroo Dept.

Dated 6 "

Despatched March 1897

Received

General No.

No. 1360

Enclosure No. one

Giving the detail of adjustment
of sum sanctioned to meet the
cost of filing the suit connected
with the land belonging to the temple
of the Hadinaachenniguroya
Swami temple.

12/3/97

Vide nos $\frac{1002+1003}{163-92}$ 20-3-9

No. 1

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Mysore District

Dated Mysore 6th March 1897

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
in the Moogara Department.


Sir,

In reply to your despatch No. C. 49 dated 16th ultimo, I have the honor to state that the Amildar reports that out of Rupees 80 sanctioned to meet the cost of filing the suit plus Rs. 8-12-0 drawn as an advance from the funds of the Sree Kanteswara Swami temple, a sum of Rupees 88-3-5 was expended as detailed in the accompanying Canarese patti, and the balance 0-8-7 is kept available for further expenses. The aforesaid advance of Rs. 8-12-0 was adjusted out of Rs. 50 subsequently sanctioned in Government Order No. 578-9 dated 13th October 1896.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most Obedt. Servant.


Deputy Commissioner
of the Mysore District

Compd. Obedt.

MUZRAI.

1897

From

The Secretary to the

Government of Mysore.

To

The Comptroller to the
Government of Mysore

Dated

Dispatched

20

22nd

March 1897.

Received

Enclosure

No 1

General No.

1002

Muzrai P. No.

163-92

With reference to
Government Proceedings
No. 518-9 dated 13th Dec^r
1896, has the honor to
forward herewith duly
Countersigned for adjust-
ment a Statement of
Expenditure amounting
to Rs 88.3.5 incurred
by the Dy. Comm^r.

out of the advances
drawn by him

Mysore District for
the conduct of the Civil
Suit in respect of the

unauthorized alienation
of the ~~lands~~ ^{Certain} lands belonging
attached to the free
Thennigirayaswami
Temple at Hadinaru,
Nanjungu Taluk

In order

As

Murthy

N^o 1003 d/ Aug
163-92-21 20-3-97

Cop^y to the Dy. Commr.,
Mysore Dist. for infoⁿ
with reference to his
N^o 1360 of 6. March 97.

In order

As

Murthy

Aug

1897

From

The Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
~~Revenue and General~~ Departments.
Mysore

Dated 13th

Despatched 19th

Received

General No. 82.
No.

Enclosure No. 1.

Sanction
No.
22/11/97

Submitting for the
Sanction of Government
a bill for Rs 50/- to meet
the Court costs in Con-
-nexion with the ^{civil.} suit
for the recovery of the
possession of the lands
belonging to Hadimaru
Chennigaraya Swamy
temple in the Nanjundes
Taluk.

To the same no 577-8d/23 H.9

No. 82
Enclosure No. 1

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE,
MYSORE DISTRICT,
Dated Mysore 1st Nov. 1897.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
~~Revenue and General Department,~~
Mysore

SIR,

Amount of Rs 80/- was
mentioned in Government Proceedings
No. 123-4 dated 1st August 1893 towards
No. 7/163-92
Cost of filing a Civil suit against
Sreenivasappa Bhatta Archak of
Sri Chennarayana Swamy temple
Hadinara in the Nanjanad Taluk
for the Cancellation of the alienation
made by him of the lands belonging
to the temple and the recovery of the
possession thereof. The said sum of
Rs 80/- having been expended a further
advance

~~of Rs 50/- having been sanctioned for further~~
advance of Rs 50/- was solicited and
the same was sanctioned in Government
Proceedings No 5189 dated 13th October
1896, and details of expenditure for
Rs 88-3-5 out of Rs 130/- already re-
-ceived have been furnished with this
Office ^{Letter} ~~Rs 50/-~~ No 1225 dated 6th
February 1897.

2 The Amildar now states
that only Rs 4-2-11 remains out of the
said Rs 130/-, that the order of the ori-
-ginal Court has been appealed against
by the Archak in the District Judge
Court and that a further supply
of funds to the amount of Rs 50/- is
necessary to meet the future Court
Costs.

3. I beg therefore that the en-
-closed bill for ^{another advance of} Rs 50/- may be

Sanctioned the charge being met ²⁸
from the General Surplus fund
as on the previous occasion.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obedient Servant

By Commissioner
Mysore District

Govt. No: No. $\frac{123-4}{\text{Muz 7163-92}}$ D

18th August 1893 sanctioning
Rs 80 towards the cost of
filing a civil suit against
one Sreenivasa Bhatta, Archak
of the Sri Chennigaraya-
swami temple at Kadinam
Nanjangud Taluk for the
cancellation of the alienation
made by him of certain
Kandayam lands belonging
to the temple and the recovery
of the possession thereof.

Govt. No: No. $\frac{518-9}{\text{Muz 7163-92}}$ D

12th October 1896 sanctioning
an additional sum of
Rs 50 for the above purpose.

And:- Letter No: 82 D 12th
November 1897 from the

My son's Dist. reporting that the amounts sanctioned in the above orders of Govt. have been already expended and requesting a further advance of Rs 50 to meet the Court costs, as the Archak has appealed to the District Court, against the decree of the Munsiff of Nanjangud.

Order thereon.

No 577-8 Enl
Muz 7/163-92
2/23-11. 97

The further advance of Rs 50 now asked for by the ~~Archak~~ is sanctioned, and the bill for the amount the charge being met from the District Muz. Sur. Funds of Rs 3793-13-1 available on the 18th Oct. 1897 as per

Treasurer's Certificate
of Rs 50 on the bill Muz. Secy. Muz.

To. The Dist. Mysore Dt. with the bill
Compt. Mysore Govt.

the 1st in the (ind) branch,
it may also be sent
here for disposal. Pk

ask the Govt. Advocate
to quote the previous
orders of Govt. on the
subject of the former
details of the case.
Pk
25/8.

189

19 8 9

From

The Govt. Advocate
in Mysore.

To

THE SECY. TO THE GOVT. OF MYSORE
(G.N. & REV. DEPTS.)

Dated 17th Aug: 1899.

Despatched

Received 19/8.

General No. 39
No.

Enclosure No. 1

Requesting to be
informed whether he
is to appear & conduct
the appeal referred to
in No. 26. D/14th inst.
from Dy Commr. Mysore.

References to be marked.

Sub? In order, Please see para 7 of order
No. 4668- in 1379 25-9-88, regarding instructions
for conduct of suits filed against Govt. & others

()

1/10/99

Please obtain previous
refers to the matter has.

OFFICE OF THE
GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE IN MYSORE.

DATED 17th August 1899.

No. 39
in. No.

From

THE GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE
IN MYSORE.

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE,
GENERAL AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

Sir,

In forwarding a copy of
letter No 26, dated the 14th August
for your information, addressed
to me by the Dy Commr of Mysore,
I have the honor to request to be informed
whether I am to appear & conduct the
appeal before the Chief Court referred
to in the said letter of the Dy Commissioner.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Yours most obedt Servt.
B. B. B.
Government Advocate

From

The Dy Commissioner
Mysore Dist.

To

The Govt Advocate
Bangalore

Dated

14th

Despatched

16th

} August 99

Received

General No. 26 of 1899-900
No.

Enclosure No. one file

Has the honor to
request that he will
be so good as to appear
in the Chief Court
for the undersigned
(Respondent) in the
2^d Appeal N^o 68 of 1898,
Rengammah.

The Dy Commissioner, Mysore District (Mysore
Case). The Case stands adjourned to the
13th September 1899. The file of papers
connected with the appeal including the
copies of judgments of the Lower Courts
as per Form attached is herewith sent.

/ Signed M. Nanjaraja Rao

In Dy Commissioner
Mysore Dist

"Copy"

For and on behalf of
Government Advocate

The South Advocate
in Mysore.

No. 2730.
9247.
Dated: 25th August 1899.

His letter No. 39. dated the 17th
August 1899 requesting to be
informed whether he is to appear
and conduct the appeal before
the Chief Court in the 2nd
appeal No. 68 of 98-99 (Rungam
vs the Deputy Commr of Mysore).

Adverting to the above, has
the honor to request that he
will be so good as to quote
the previous orders of Court on
the subject, giving also ~~the~~
details

details of the case.

By a/c
MH 25/8
for secy

189 1884
2555

The Court of Directors in Mysore
Bangalore

GOVT. OF MYSORE,
BANGALORE.

Dated 28th August 1899

Dispatched

Received 28/8/99

General No. 46.
No.

Enclosure No.

Forwarding for perusal &
Believing Return to Court Judge
Copies ~~to~~.

References to be marked.

LC for perusal
MB
30/8/99

Please send this to
Mysore Branch. Rf 30/8/99

Vide no 241 d/31/8/99

DATED 28th August 1899.No. 46
En. No.

From

THE GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE
IN MYSORE.

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE,
GENERAL AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

Sir,

In reply to your letter No. 2730,
J 247
Dated 25th Instant I have the honor to
forward for perusal & obliging return
the copies of judgments of two Courts
which would give the details of the case

From the file of the papers received
from the Deputy Commissioners of Mysore
I find that an order has been passed
for the institution of the suit in question.
(Vide Pro. order No. 750
Muz. F. 163-927 14 May 1899)

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Yours most obedient servant.

S. Kannaiah
Government Advocate

189

request to appear
before the Chief
Court ~~at Muzrai~~
the Appeal Court

From

To

The Govt Advocate

referred to in the above.

2. The Copies of the
Judgments of the

lower courts forwarded

asked for ref^l. under

Cover of his letter

No 46. of 28th Aug 99

are herewith

returned

B. V.

W. I.

Mr. Sanyal

Dated 21. 8-99

Despatched 2-9-99

Received

General No. 241

Muzrai F. No. 163-92

Enclosure No.

Judgment
- 2 copies

His letter No 39

of 17th Aug 1899.

requesting to be

informed whether

has been in compliance

with the Mysore R^y

Requisition, he

might appear ^{before} ~~at~~

the Chief Court

to conduct the 2ndappeal ~~before~~

No. 68 of 1898-99

by ~~order~~ of the Dy. Commr. relating to a

Right in sh. title

by the Dy. Commr. ~~as~~

in his capacity

as Dist. Muz. Officer
for the possession of
~~the property of~~ certain

lands. ~~Classified~~ on

behalf of the

Chennazhiagawany
Temple at Hadnaru,

Nannugud Taluk

In reply has the
hon^{ble} to ~~State~~ ^{State} that
the Dist. Advocate

may ~~be~~ ^{be} appear on behalf of
the Dy. Commr.

M.
28/10/5

Draft Subd
H
1/3/02

From

H. 201
The Govt. Advocate
in Mysore

To

THE SECY. TO THE GOVT. OF MYSORE,
GEN. & REV. DEPT.

Dated 20 Feb. 102

Despatched

Received

General No. 126
No.

Enclosure No. 2

Ends. for informant a copy
of decree passed by the
Cdp. Court in second appeal
No 68 of 1898-99 Remuneration
at the d.t. of Mysore &
enclosing a bill for Rs. 15-8-9
by his fees for conducting
the above appeal in

2230
The papers in this connection
were sent to the Mysore Rs
on 30.8.99.

M.B.
26.2.02 Please call for the same

M.B.
26/2/02
Mysore Dept
References to be marked.

Please put up the regd papers.
M.B.
26.2.02 Please state in what volume
or for what of the papers
sent for reference

From

The Government Advocate
in Mysore

To

The Secretary
to the Government of Mysore
Rev: & Genl: Departments

Sir

With reference to your letter
no ~~281~~ ¹⁸⁸ 92 dated 31-8-1899 I have
the honor to forward for information
a copy of decree passed by the Chief
Court in Second Appeal no: 68 of
1898-99 Rungamah vs the Deputy
Commissioner of Mysore.

I beg to enclose herein
a bill for ^{Rs 13-8-9} ~~Rs 15-8-9~~ being my
fees for conducting the above —
appeal and request that the —
Government

Government will be pleased to accord
sanction for the same. 15
5,

I have the honor to be
Sir

Your most obedient Servant

Sd/- *James D. ...*

Government Advocate

President
The Justice A. Rameshchandra Sivaswami
Bewari Bahadur
and
Justice J. Karahari Rao - Judge.

Second Appeal No. --- 88. --- of 1898-99

Rangamma Appellant. } Vs. { The Deputy Commissioner
of Mysore. Respondent

Appeal from the *decree* of the Court of the Addl. Sub Judge of
Mysore dated the - 10th - day of October --- 1898.

MEMORANDUM OF APPEAL

The Deputy Commissioner of Mysore - plaintiff.

Rangamma 2nd Defendant.

APPELLANT

Rangamma.

above named appeals to the Chief Court of Mysore - - - - -

against the decree of the Addl. Sub Judge
of Mysore - - - - - *appeal*
in suit No. 388.

of 1896-97 dated the - 10th - day of October
1898, for the following reasons, namely :-

- I The Court below erred in law in holding that under the provision
of Section 229 of the Mysore Land Revenue Code, the Revenue Court
is not prohibited from entertaining this suit.
- II In as much as it was found by the Court below that
the suit land was resumed by the Government in 1880 as
per Exhibit F. 7, on the ground that the temple of Chennarayana
had

temple they copied in Caw-in building that the subsequent grant of the full amount to the 1st plaintiff who was the hereditary property of the temple did not alter its character as income & effect a new tenure in his own favour.

On the passing of judgment in this appeal in the presence of

M. L. Srinivasa Sengar. Advocate for the Appellant, and
It is ordered and decreed that *M. S. Ranganna Sengar* Advocate for the Respondent.

And it is further ordered and decreed that the *appellant.*
Ranganna aforesaid do pay to the *Respondent, the Deputy Commissioner*
of Mysore aforesaid the sum of Rupees *15-8-9.*
being the amount of costs incurred by the *Respondent.*
aforesaid in this Court with interest
at 6% per annum
thereon from this date until the date of realization.

And it is further ordered and decreed that the . . .
. . . aforesaid do pay to the
aforesaid the sum of Rupees . . .
being the amount of costs incurred in the lower Court with interest thereon
from the date of the decree of the said lower Court to the date of realization.

GIVEN under ^{our} ~~my~~ hand and the seal of the Court this 30th
day of *October* 1901.

Ed. A. Ramachandrarao
1007 T. Narhari Rao
Judges.

			By the Appellant.			By the Respondent.		
			Rs.	A.	P.	Rs.	A.	P.
Court Fee on Memo of Appeal	...	...	21	"	"	"	"	"
„ Power of Attorney	...	...	2	"	"	2	"	"
„ Processes	...	...	"	8	"	"	"	"
„ Copies of Decree and Judgment	...	...	1	8	"	"	"	"
„ Advocate's Fee	...	...	13	8	9	13	8	9
„ Cost of Adjournment	...	...	"	"	"	"	"	"
„ Fees for copying or translating	...	...	3	3	4	"	"	"
„ Printing charges	...	...	"	"	"	"	"	"
„ Costs on remand	...	...	"	"	"	"	"	"
Total Rs. ..			41	12	1	15	8	9

Ed. A. Ramachandra Rao
1/10/17 T. N. Narayana Rao

Copy

Judge.

Government Advocate
Advocate for Appellant.

Advocate for Respondent.

Read: —

Letter no 126 dated
20th February 1902, from
the Govt Advocate
in Mysore, submitted
for sanction, a bill
for Rs 13-8-9, being his
fees for conducting
as authorized in the Mysore
Secretary's despatch no 241
dated 31st August 1899¹⁶³⁻⁹²,
Second Appeal no 68
of 1898-99 - (Ranganatha
versus The Dy Commr
of Mysore) on the file of
the Chief Commr

No: 14656-72
J. 1228.75/32 Order thereon: —

The bill for
Rs 13-8-9 received
with the above, is
sanctioned, subject
to adjustment in due
course after recovery
of the amount from

(Suit for the recovery of certain lands belonging to the Sri Chennigarayawami temple at Hadinaru in the Nanjund Taluk)

Reference - Letter No 220 dated 8th January, 1905 from the Dy: Commissioner, Mysore Dist.

A suit on the civil side had to be filed against one Trinivasa Bhatta, Achak of the Chennigarayawami temple at Hadinaru in the Nanjund Taluk for the cancellation of the alienation of made by him of certain temple lands & for the recovery of the possession thereof. A sum of Rs 80 + 50 + 50 + ~~13-8-9~~ + 13-8-9 amounting in all to Rs 193-8-9 was sanctioned from time to time for contending the suit in the lower courts & the Chief Court.

Revised:

Rs
10/1/05
Revised

1904-05
From N. Venkata Rao Esq
Dy. Commr. Picher
Mysore Dist

To L. Anantarami Rao
Secretary to Govt.
Muzrai Department

Dated 8th January 1905
Despatched

Received

General No. 220
No.

Enclosure No. 1/16

Submits for sanction
a bill for Rs 100/- being the
pleader's fee to be paid
to Mr. C. Ranganna, Plea
for conducting a case filed
against the Archak of the
Chennigayya Swami
temple at Hadinara in the
J. Narripur Taluk.

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Mysore District
Muzrai Department
Dated Mysore 7th January, 1905

L. Anantasaiah Iyengar Esq: B.A.
Secretary to the Government of Mysore
in the Muzrai Department.

Sir,

I have the honor to submit herewith for sanction a bill amounting to Rs 100/- presented by Mr. C. Ranganna, Pleader for having appeared and conducted the case filed against the Archak of the Chennigarayasaami Temple at Hadimaru in the Nanjangud Taluk for the recovery of the lands attached to the Temple.

2. The Amildar reports that execution application has been filed for the recovery of the decreed amount and that the Pleader's fee viz. Rs 100/- may be paid out of the amount viz. Rs 559-7-8 deposited in the Savings Bank at the credit of the Institution.

3. The correspondence on the subject is herewith submitted.

I have the honor to be
Your most ^{Sir} obedient servant
N. Venkatarao
Deputy Commissioner
District.

Mysore

Read:— Letter no 220
dated 8 January 1901
from the Dy: Commr.,
Mysore D., submitting
for sanction a bill for
Rs 100/- being the Pleader's
fee & due to Mr C. Ranganatha
for having appeared and
conducted the case for
the recovery of the ~~land~~
the possession of certain
lands belonging to the Sri
Chennigayayawami temple
at Hadinaru in the
Nanjungud Taluk
which had been alienated
by the archik thereof

Order thereon no

no: 2819-20 Encls 12 Rte,

m: 7: 163-92

107 4-2-05,

The bill for Rs 100/-
is sanctioned and
forwarded to the
comptroller.

for audit, the charge
being met from the sum
of Rs 55-9-7-8 deposited
in the Savings Bank at
the order of the Dy. Commr.

2- The Dy. Commr. should
see to the early recovery
of the amount decreed in
favour of the temple and
the adjustment of the
mount sanctioned from time
to time on account of

meeting the court costs.

3- ^{first} ~~the~~ ^{recovery of the} ~~action~~ ^{final} taken for
the recovery of the possession
of the lands and for their
cultivation should be ^{also}
reported for the information
of Govt.

Dy. Commr. 2/2/05

To
Secretary
The Dy. Commr., Mysore
with refg the other encls
" Comptroller, Mysore
" "